The Larvae of Euclidia glyphica, L., and E. mi, Cl.

By E. A. COCKAYNE, D.M., F.R.C.P., F.E.S.

In an attempt to identify a larva, which I found at Folkestone in 1899 and at first attributed to *glyphica*, I was unable to find any description of a British species with which it agreed and thought it must be the larva of some rare immigrant. My first surmise was right. But my search has revealed such an amazing number of incorrect descriptions and figures in both British and continental works that I have ventured to send the following notes and quotations. They demonstrate a series of errors, which in the case of such common insects must be almost without a parallel.

The larvae of our two species of *Euclidia* are very similar in colour and markings, the most obvious difference in this respect being that, in *glyphica* there is a fairly large oblong chocolate-coloured spot situated on the pale mid-ventral surface of the 8th segment and a much smaller one on the 7th, whereas in *mi* these are wanting. It is the number of prolegs which has given rise to all the trouble. *E. mi* has only three pairs, those proper to the 7th and 8th segments being entirely absent. *E. glyphica* has four pairs, those proper to the 7th segment being absent and those on the 8th reduced to about half the size of the others. Thus *mi* is twelve footed, and *glyphica* is fourteen footed.

Humphreys and Westwood in *British Moths and their Transformations*, 1851, say of the genus *Euclidia*, "Mr. Stephens, indeed, described them as sixteen footed, which Mr. Curtis attempted to correct, by stating that they possess fourteen feet, ingeniously throwing a leaf over that portion of his figure of the larva, which would have shown his own error." This little gibe would have been more justifiable if these authors had given a correct description themselves. Unfortunately they call the larva twelve footed and Humphreys repeats the mistake in his *British Moths*. The figure of *glyphica* in Curtis' *British Entomology*, is a masterpiece. The prolegs on the 9th and 10th segments are clearly shown, but a little leaf of trifolium prevents one from seeing whether there are any on the 7th or 8th.

The letterpress, too, is worded with skilful ambiguity. In small print Curtis says "the larvae of *Euclidia* have but fourteen feet, not sixteen as stated by Mr. Stephens." In some general remarks in large print lower down on the same page he says the larvae are "semi-loopers, cylindric, naked, with 6 pectoral, 4 abdominal and 2 anal feet." The first is correct if applied to *glyphica*, the second to *mi*, but neither applies to the genus as a whole. In his special description of *mi* he states definitely and correctly that there are 4 abdominal feet, but in that of *glyphica* he gives no number. In Stainton's *Manual* and in his *British Butterflies and Moths* both species are said to have 12 legs, and Wilson in his *Larvae of the British Lepidoptera* quotes the *Manual* in the case of *glyphica* without giving a figure. Newman, in his *Illustrated Natural History of British Moths*, says "the larva of *glyphica* is figured by Hübner and there are but two pairs of ventral claspers (on the 9th and 10th segments)." Meyrick, *Handbook of British Lepidoptera*, gives in his definition of *Euclidia*, "Larva slender without prolegs on 7 and 8." Buckler, *Larvae of British Butterflies and Moths*, copies Porritt's description correctly from

the *Ent. Mo. Mag.*, 1881, xvii., p. 210, stating that there are no prolegs on the 7th, 8th, 11th and 12th segments in the larva *glyphica*, and in figure, a dorso-lateral view, the prolegs are not visible. In the case of *mi* Buckler's figures are beautiful and the description is correct.

South figures the larva of *mi* correctly, but contents himself with saying that that of *glyphica* is very similar. Tutt, in his *British Moths*, avoids all mention of the legs of both species.

The Continental authors are almost as confusing. Hübner's figure of *glyphica*, in his *Geschichte Europaïscher Schmetterlinge Raupen*, is a good one, except that the first pair of prolegs is left out. Herrich-Schäffer in his description makes the same blunder. Hofmann, in the *Europäischen Schmetterling's Raupen*, 1874, figures the larva of *glyphica* with five pairs of prolegs, making it sixteen footed, and gives no number in his meagre description. In the 1893 edition he gives a new lateral view of the larva with only three pairs of legs, but in the text he is right, making *mi* twelve footed and *glyphica* fourteen footed. In the 1910 (Spuler) edition the same figure appears with the addition of a small pair of prolegs on the 8th segment, to make the figure agree with the text. Lampert, *Gross-Schmetterlinge und Raupen Mitteleuropas*, 1906, makes no mistake in his description, but his figure shows the larva of *glyphica* like that of *mi*, with the first two pairs of prolegs absent.

Kirby, in his *European Butterflies and Moths*, 1882, appears to have been the first to describe both larvae correctly. Seitz gives the name *Gonospileia*, Hbn., to the genus, but says that the first and second pairs of prolegs are aborted. He divides the genus into two sections based on a difference in the tibial spines. *Mi* falls into the first, *glyphica* into the second section.

Hampson attaches greater importance to this difference in the tibial spines, and places *mi* in the genus *Euclidimera*, and *glyphica* in *Gonospileia*.

This appears to me more correct, because apart from the larval difference the genitalia of these two species are widely different, as Pierce has shown in his *Genitalia of the Noctuidae*, and as I have confirmed by my own preparations. The harpes in *glyphica* are extremely asymmetrical, whereas those of *mi* are almost symmetrical. Even with Hampson's separation neither *Euclidimera* nor *Gonospileia* are homogeneous, as I hope to prove in a second paper.

The New Forest in the rain.

By RUSSELL E. JAMES, F.E.S.

It is now many years since I last visited the New Forest, and the fact that my son had never been there in the "butterfly" time prompted me to arrange a short holiday in early July. The cold wet weather began about the date we fixed to start, and during our stay with the exception of one or two very short spells it rained continuously. In spite of this handicap we worked away steadily and in the end came out with very good results, although needless to say, it proved less of a "butterfly" holiday than we had anticipated.

We left Waterloo mid-day on the 2nd and had arranged to spend the first few days at a village just over the Dorset border from Fordingbridge, where in 1910 I had found *Triphaena subsequa* in